

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-9, 11 and 13-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by De Armas et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,873,064). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The Applicant's interface navigation system allows the user of the electronic product to employ a word or phrase of the user's own choosing in association with a stored location. This makes Applicant's system highly flexible and useful, as the user can choose anything he or she likes as a "label" with which to navigate to a given location within a navigation structure. For example, a user may chose to associate the phrase "call home" with a destination /PhoneBook/Home/Send. The art of record does not teach or suggest such flexibility. De Armas uses a fixed set of voice commands that are associated with different navigation destinations within the traversable menu structure. Thus, DeArmas requires the user to learn which voice commands have been assigned, rather than allowing the user to create and store his or her own commands.

In order to more fully distinguish Applicant's invention, claims 1 and 2 have been amended to include, in part, "obtaining a first utterance of speech comprising at least one word chosen by a user of said electronic product" and "storing said first utterance of speech chosen by said user." Moreover, claim 15 includes, in part, "a processor for adding user-defined speech to said lexicon." De Armas does not disclose these features.

DETAILED DISCUSSION

De Armas teaches a voice action macro method for mapping spoken commands to a given windows application. Each application has various application states. (Col. 5, lines 16-18). Each application state is defined by a set of windows objects. (Col. 5, lines 18-20). The method of De Armas includes creating a sub-context tree comprising a plurality of sub-context objects for each application state and assigning a set of attributes for each sub-context object. (Col. 5, lines 46-69; Figure 2, steps 42-44). Then, at step 46 in Figure 2, "each window object is preferably analyzed to determine an appropriate set of spoken commands which must be uttered by a user in order to activate or act upon the object." (Col. 6, lines 45-49). The set of spoken commands define the vocabulary set 80. (Col. 6., lines 43-45). In other words, the determined set of spoken commands that activate various macros in De Armas are obtained from a pre-defined list of commands of the system. The set of spoken commands are not obtained from words chosen by a user of the system. Further, De Armas does not store words chosen by a user of the system in the set of spoken commands.

In contrast, the present invention as described in claims 1, 2, and 15 discloses building a lexicon (e.g. the vocabulary set 80 of De Armas) of spoken commands by

using user-defined speech. The present invention in claim 15 discloses “a processor for adding user-defined speech to said lexicon.” De Armas teaches an action of an edit box that inserts an appropriate text string *“in the edit box* when the user speaks the vocabulary phrase.” (Col. 7, Line 23-37). The action of the edit box as disclosed by De Armas is not to insert an appropriate text string *in the vocabulary set 80*. Accordingly, De Armas fails to teach every element of claims 1, 2, and 15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10, 12 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Armas et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,873,064) in view of Croft (U.S. Pat. No. 6,493,670 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 10, 12, and 19-20 are dependent on claims 2 and 15 and for the reasons set forth above, distinguish over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 6, 2005

By: Gregory A. Stobbs
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600